DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 258 175 CS 208 865

AUTHOR Lewis, Dorothy P.
TITLE The Role of Interest in Students' Writing Fluency and the Quality of the Product.
PUB DATE [83]
NOTE 25p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Comparative Analysis; Females; Grade 12; High Schools; *Individual Differences; Males; Sex Differences; Stereotypes; *Student Attitudes; Writing Evaluation; *Writing Instruction; *Writing Research; *Writing Skills
IDENTIFIERS *Writing Attitudes

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to examine the effects of students' interests on their writing. A group of 571 high school seniors, fluent and nonfluent in writing, completed a questionnaire dealing with aspects of writing interest, such as subject, form, or voice. Tape recorded interviews addressing the same aspects were conducted with 11 fluent seniors from another school. Findings from each section of the questionnaire, along with comments made by both fluent and nonfluent students, were compared with responses to corresponding questions in the interview. The results indicated few discernible differences between writing interests of fluent and nonfluent writers. Girls' choices for writing genres seemed to fit social expectations that they prefer sentimental, personal varieties of writing. Boys, however, were much less predictable. The findings suggest that teachers can assume a great many common interests among their grade 12 students, such as preference for writing from a personal viewpoint about familiar topics. However, individual differences will determine each student's approach to these general perspectives. The results also suggest that while students prefer writing in the reflexive mode, once they have experienced increasingly demanding writing assignments, students apparently enjoy a variety of forms and contextual patterns. (HTH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy

ED258175

The Role of Interest in Students' Writing Fluency and the Quality of the Product

Dorothy P. Lewis

Clarksville High School

Running Head: The Role of Interest in Students' Writing

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Dorothy P. Lewis
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

The Role of Interest in Students' Writing

Dorothy P. Lewis
Clarksville High School
800 High School Drive
Clarksville, IN 47130
Telephone: 812-282-7753 (School)
812-282-2695 (Home)

Abstract

This study examined the role that interest plays in writing. The investigation had a twofold approach: a questionnaire administered to a representative group of 571 twelfth grade students in the Jefferson County (Kentucky) Public Schools and case studies of the writing interests of eleven fluent twelfth grade students from the Clarksville (Indiana) high School. The questionnaire used for the quantitative facet of the study consisted of seven sections, each dealing with one aspect of writing interest, such as subject, form, or voice. Total responses were submitted to the chi-square test of independence. Boy/girl and fluent/non-fluent responses were submitted to a z-test to determine if there were discernible differences. The qualitative aspect of the study took the form of case studies, including taped interviews structured to elicit responses to the same seven areas addressed on the survey. In addition, the interviewed students were encouraged to talk as freely as possible about any aspect of their writing experience. Finally, findings from each section of the questionnaire, along with comments made by both fluent and non-fluent students, were compared with responses to corresponding questions in the interview. These comparisons yield data that raises significant questions about traditional practices in language arts classrooms; it also both supports and contradicts current composition theory.

The Role of Interest in Students' Writing

Fluency and the Quality of the Product

As early as 1964, Bloom questioned whether the development of cognitive and affective behaviors shows a positive relation or if rather in some instances there may be an inverse relation between growth in the two domains. He gave an example of literature courses that instill knowledge of the history of literature and knowledge of literary selections while lowering interest in literary works even to the level of aversion. Although the measurement of cognitive development is easier than is the measurement of affective development, the importance of interest--what students like to think, talk, and write about--demands attention.

When reading instruction came under attack in 1955 as typified by Flesch's Why Johnny Can't Read, studies of reading interest, as reflected in Literature and the Reader (Purves and Beach, 1972), proliferated. But not until Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Schoer's Research in Written Composition (1963) showed how little was known about teaching writing and that the majority of research was centered on product, was attention turned to the composing process. In discussing traditional rhetoric and composition texts and handbooks (still widely in evidence in secondary schools), Emig (1971) noted that how the writers feel about the subject matter and how their feelings may influence what they write--the affective dimension--are not really considered in these texts.

Psychologists, Lemon (1973) and Fishbein (1965) view and define attitude in somewhat different ways. Although they differ in their schemata, they agree

that attitude is learned and that it affects overt behavior. Even though his theories were promulgated shortly after the turn of the century, Dewey (1913) presents a similar explication of the term interest and its role also in affecting overt behavior. He sees interest as active, projective, or propulsive and dynamic rather than static or inert. It is objective, in that interest does not end simply in itself but centers on an object of regard. It is personal; it signifies a direct concern, recognition of something at stake, something whose outcome is important to the individual. In determining the role of interest in students' writing fluency and the quality of the product, this study accepts the three characteristics noted by Dewey.

The focus of several studies has been the effects of negative feelings toward writing: Daly and Miller's development of an instrument to measure writing apprehension (1975); Bloom's investigation of students' anxieties (1980); Rose's consideration of writer's block (1980); and Gay's projects relating inappropriate writing instruction to anxiety and a negative attitude toward writing (1980). Concurrently, researchers started scrutinizing the inseparability of mind and body. Perl (1980), in studying the recursive nature of writing, applied the term felt sense to the reaction of writers when they pause to respond to what is already within them in relation to a word or idea. Izard (1977) in numerous studies of infants recognized that affective and cognitive processes are intertwined from the very beginning of life. Through attention to the studies and theories developed by others Izard concluded that one's interest guides one's perception and thought and focuses each person's attention. He makes a case for devoting much more attention to the relationship between interest and cognition development which informs the teaching of writing. Berthoff (1978) and Emig (1977) suggest that interest is of primary importance to learning and that writing is a complex activity.

The theme that ties together the thought of Perl, Izard, Berthoff, and Emig is that the act of composing involves both cognitive and affective elements. The cognitive allows writers to assemble ideas, put them into words, and organize words into discourse. The affective, combining as much physical sense as mental activity, creates images, generates ideas, and motivates the writer toward processing the piece of discourse. The interaction of these two elements ebbs and flows throughout the process, often making the difference between a writing task carried to completion or a writing task deserted along the way.

Although publications in recent years indicate a growing concern for the role of the affective generally, especially the emotions of fear and anxiety as they are manifested in writing apprehension, few studies are being reported that deal with students' writing interests.

In his study of students' interests in writing activities from grades one through eight, Hogan (1980) found that for some areas of the curriculum, useful information about students' interests and preferences has become available: reading, mathematics, and science. Hogan analyzed the results of a self-report inventory comprised of over two hundred fifty different items, twenty of which dealt specifically with writing activities, ranging from elements of writing such as spelling or making compound words to composing activities such as writing letters, stories, or reports. His results confirmed his expectation that students' attitudes toward school activities become less favorable with an increase in grade level; however, there were some differences in the rate of decline for writing and the other areas. While in other areas there was a marked degree of decline from grade one through four, interest in writing activities showed hardly any decline. Writing interest remained somewhat higher than interest in other curricular areas from grades three through six, after which it declined precipitously from grades six through eight. Britton

(1975) notices the same decline in interest occurring with British students at about the same level. He attributed the loss of student interest to an increased intensity on their teachers' part in anticipating the approach of fifth form examinations. As the time for the examination drew nearer, teachers required a greater degree of abstraction in writing assignments. Other studies which touch upon the role of interest in writing are those by LaCampagne (1968), Bell (1971), and Baldwin and Wolford (1979).

Procedures

Intensive background study of research techniques (Birdie and Anderson, 1974; Buck, 1976; Coughlin, 1983; Dewey, 1919; Fenstermacher, 1980; Lemon, 1973; Myers, 1983; Purves and Beach, 1976; and Wilson, 1971) determined both the quantitative and qualitative dimensions of this study. The population selected was composed of two groups: 571 representative twelfth grade students in the Jefferson County (Kentucky) Public Schools and 11 twelfth grade students in Clarksville (Indiana) High School. The rationale for choosing students who had virtually completed their high school careers was arrived at after much consideration. At that point in their academic lives, public school students had probably experienced a wide range of composition situations. This experience, along with the cognitive, emotional, social, and cultural development associated with the normal maturation of young adults reaching or rapidly approaching age eighteen, would allow them to make retrospective judgments with some degree of objectivity. Administration of the questionnaires and interview appointments were delayed as long as possible in the academic year so that students would be well toward completion of their secondary school education.

Research Design: Quantitative

An obvious advantage of the questionnaire is that it can be distributed to a great number of people in a minimum amount of time; therefore, an instrument was devised which would provide information about students' interest in topic, viewpoint, mode, form (in both reflexive and extensive modes), degree of abstraction, and rhetorical context. The instrument was devised to be as concise as possible and still provide the information needed. Rank ordering was used in order to include as many entires as feasible within a limited time and to force the students to deliberate before marking their responses. A pilot study showed that the class time required to administer the questionnaire would be less than twenty minutes. After changes suggested by the pilot study were made, instructions for the teacher and the questionnaire for the students were duplicated in preparation for distribution. Included in the instructions for the teachers were the following definitions:

Fluent - Students who seem to experience little difficulty in generating written materials and produce papers that although perhaps not perfect on the surface do have good ideas that can be made acceptable by a careful editing out of surface errors.

Non-fluent - Students who exhibit one or more of the following characteristics: great difficulty in generating writing; produce papers with little regard for organizing their ideas; write papers seriously marred by errors in mechanics and usage.

Students were asked to rank order the questionnaire items using the following scale:

1 - most interested

2 - somewhat interested

3 - indifferent

4 - interested very little

5 - least interested

Questionnaire

I would prefer

I. (A) _____ writing about an incident from my childhood.

(B) _____ writing about a situation that's a problem in my school or community.

(C) _____ writing about a character or situation in a story.

(D) _____ writing about a topic I've discussed in English or any other class.

(E) _____ writing about a situation that's entirely imaginary.

II. (A) _____ writing as if I'm watching an event but not involved, like a newspaper reporter.

(B) _____ writing anonymously so the reader doesn't know who's speaking.

(C) _____ writing as if I'm someone else such as a neighbor, teacher, or salesperson.

(D) _____ writing as if I'm a character in a story.

(E) _____ writing as myself.

III. (A) _____ a friendly letter.

(B) _____ a completely original poem or short story.

(C) _____ a diary of my daily life.

(D) _____ a letter to the editor about a community problem.

(E) _____ a journal entry about incidents or situations I think about a great deal.

IV. (A) _____ a research report.

(B) _____ a newspaper or magazine article.

(C) _____ a poem or story following a specific pattern (like a sonnet or a limerick).

(D) _____ a business letter.

(E) _____ an essay or theme.

V. (A) _____ writing about a current event.

(B) _____ explaining in writing an issue such as censorship versus freedom of speech.

(C) _____ writing about an experience I had in grade school.

(D) _____ writing about what a word means to me, for example, love, patriotism, or injustice.

(E) _____ writing about an object, person, or event in my present daily life.

VI. (A) _____ writing an explanation of how to do something I can do.

(B) _____ writing about a topic from science or history or any other school subject.

(C) _____ writing about my past experiences.

(D) _____ writing a poem or story for myself or for others.

(E) _____ writing about my thoughts and feelings.

VII. (A) _____ keeping a journal in which I express my own feelings and opinions, but the teacher looks only at the number of pages and does not read what I've written.

(B) _____ writing an essay to show how the parts of something fit together.

(C) _____ writing a letter to the editor of my school paper about a school rule or policy that I feel should be changed.

(D) _____ comparing and contrasting a pair of objects, people, or ideas.

(E) _____ writing a library paper for a contest in which the winning entries will be published in a magazine.

Note: In the original questionnaire, spaces for Comments were included at the end of each section.

Research Design: Qualitative

This facet of the study took the form of in-depth case studies, calculated to yield the "thick descriptions" Coughlin (1983) predicted. After receiving parental and student permission to gather confidential information from permanent records, files were perused in order to glean available test results, teacher evaluations, and so on. Next, parents completed the family background form and signed a release granting permission for the students to take part in a taped interview with the researcher. Parents, students, and researcher met to complete the necessary forms, share an explanation of the goals of the research, and provide answers to any questions the parents or students had. An interview format which would both parallel and supplement the questionnaire was devised.

Findings and Interpretation

In order both to facilitate the tabulation of results and to provide a basis for comparison, questionnaires were separated by gender and degree of fluency. A total of 652 completed responses were returned; however, eighty-one had to be disallowed because of the subjects' having failed to follow directions properly.

Responses were tabulated according to the five choices given in each section and the degree of interest expressed in each choice. Responses from each section were analyzed with the chi-square test of independence. These responses to the questionnaire are shown successively below. Roman numerals coincide with their use in the questionnaire. A significance level of .05 was

set for each analysis, and in each case the chi-square critical value with four degrees of freedom was 9.49. In the tabulations that follow, chi-square values above 9.49 are indicated by an asterisk.

I. Interest in Subject

	1	2	3	4	5	Chi-square
(A)	156	158	103	72	82	57.87*
(B)	126	125	142	105	73	24.61*
(C)	51	113	137	173	97	72.40*
(D)	40	61	96	145	229	199.60*
(E)	198	113	93	78	89	82.47*

II. Interest in Voice

	1	2	3	4	5	Chi-square
(A)	75	127	136	100	133	23.91*
(B)	58	103	124	138	148	44.56*
(C)	34	58	133	186	160	150.58*
(D)	113	176	104	100	78	47.60*
(E)	240	109	71	49	52	226.25*

III. Interest in Form: Reflexive

	1	2	3	4	5	Chi-square
(A)	241	136	88	73	33	223.56*
(B)	115	74	93	115	174	49.41*
(C)	84	136	139	88	124	24.38*
(D)	37	95	133	166	140	87.83*
(E)	94	131	115	130	101	9.76*

IV. Interest in Form: Extensive

	1	2	3	4	5	Chi-square
(A)	72	91	100	101	207	99.00*
(B)	189	152	121	82	27	137.57*
(C)	116	82	106	106	161	29.46*
(D)	97	132	131	138	73	27.66*
(E)	96	117	112	142	104	10.69*

V. Preference for Concrete/Abstract Subjects

	1	2	3	4	5	Chi-square
(A)	112	119	121	137	82	61.91*
(B)	54	66	97	120	234	258.04*
(C)	87	112	138	117	117	11.61*
(D)	103	128	117	128	95	7.73
(E)	215	145	98	70	43	161.07*

VI. Preference for Mode: Reflexive/Extensive

	1	2	3	4	5	Chi-square
(A)	115	95	132	147	82	24.50*
(B)	46	52	38	126	259	265.43*
(C)	105	157	161	100	48	76.10*
(D)	87	123	105	129	127	11.25*
(E)	218	143	85	72	53	157.46*

VII. Preference for Degree of Rhetorical Context

	1	2	3	4	5	Chi-square
(A)	204	75	70	55	167	156.27*
(B)	53	95	116	180	127	75.40*
(C)	128	146	123	114	60	47.49*
(D)	111	149	153	98	60	51.89*
(E)	75	105	110	125	156	30.67*

In summary, several students volunteered comments at the conclusion of the questionnaire that say a great deal about the writing interests of high school seniors: "I like to express my feelings, but I dread writing anything that is to be graded or criticized." "I like writing from my own experiences and my own views on matters. I'd rather not write about others [sic] opinions or or analyze others [sic] views. I also don't enjoy writing papers that require a great deal of research. These papers tend to be less expressive. I feel I do my best writing in fiction." "I wanted to say that I wish teachers would let students do more writing assignments that involved student's [sic] opinions." Obviously, students have writing interests, but their interests often don't coincide with their school-sponsored writing. Rather than the expository assignments which have dominated textbook writing suggestions during the past several decades, students prefer reflexive, informal papers written from their own viewpoint.

A comparison of boy/girl and fluent/non-fluent writers yielded additional data. Results of a z-test, which indicates the significance of the difference between two proportions of a population, reveal some important variations between degree of boy/girl responses. Table 1 shows a tabulation of z scores comparing the preferences of boys and girls. Significant scores are noted with an asterisk. Positive scores indicate a predominance of boys responding; negative scores, a predominance of girls.

Reviewing the significant differences between boy/girl responses disclosed some unexpected results. Some results followed the usual stereotypical expectations according to gender; e.g., that more girls prefer writing a poem or story following a specific pattern and that more boys prefer writing about how to do something. On the other hand, responses to a number of the items yielded surprising findings, such as boys' preferences for writing about the

imaginative and for writing in an omniscient, third person voice. Although more girls prefered structured poetry or story assignments, girls indicated an interest in having less contextual information in assignments in general. For the most part, girls' choices seem to fit the expectations of society that, given a choice, they prefer the sentimental, personal varieties of writing. Boys, to the contrary, were much less predictable. Although the differences shown here are not great, enough differences do exist to suggest that preconceived notions about just what may or may not interest boys or girls are not necessarily valid.

Results of a z-test shown in Table 2 illustrate that a comparison of fluent/non-fluent writers yields fewer significant differences than does the preceding comparison of boy/girl preferences. Significant scores are noted with an asterisk. Positive scores indicate a predominance of fluent writers responding; negative, non-fluent writers.

Insert Tables 1 and 2 about here

Although the differences shown between fluent/non-fluent writers are few by comparison with boy/girl differences and some of the differences that are shown seem relatively unimportant, the non-fluent writers' preferences are notable. Non-fluent writers might well be expected to prefer writing from a first-person viewpoint, and it follows that a friendly letter, for that reason if no other might be preferred. Non-fluent writers might also be expected to be more interested in writing a business letter than their fluent counterparts because the non-fluent students probably have received relatively more instruction in that form than in others. Two noteworthy differences between fluent/non-fluent are the non-fluent writers' interest in writing a poem or story for themselves or others and in writing a letter to the editor of their

school paper about a rule that should be changed. The fluent students' responses that differed were rather predictable. Probably because of their expanded experiences, due at least in part to their fluency, fluent writers are more amenable to expository writing assignments which require third-person viewpoint and abstract conceptualization. Comments made by non-fluent writers while fewer in number than comments by fluent writers, nevertheless, show that non-fluent writers are interested in writing and also suggest that they would enjoy experiencing a variety of assignments.

Findings from each section of the questionnaire were compared with responses to corresponding questions in the interviews. Interview transcripts and comments included in the questionnaires augmented the data collected from the questionnaires.

Questionnaire Section I - Interest in Subject

Student responses in the interviews to the subject-related choices closely parallel the tabulated student responses to the questionnaire. Both groups indicated a preference for writing about a situation that is entirely imaginary and a strong interest in writing about incidents from their childhoods. To students, these two choices were similar in that both childhood incidents and imaginary situations are under their control while the other three choices are teacher-assigned.

Questionnaire Section II - Interest in Voice

Students from both groups preferred writing as themselves or role playing a character in a story. On the other hand, role playing some community associate was least popular with both groups. This circumstance suggests that students prefer the familiar, perhaps feeling more comfortable in a fictional role because they can turn to the text for concrete evidence rather than assuming a role in which they have to speculate about the viewpoint of an

adult. A relatively small number chose anonymity as their first preference. None of the interviewed students did so.

Questionnaire Section III - Interest in Form: Reflexive

In their preferences for reflexive forms, the two groups of students show their first difference of choice. While the students in the large-group study by far preferred the friendly letter, the interviewed students showed a strong preference for writing journal entires about incidents or situations they think about a great deal. Although most students did not specifically refer to audience, both the friendly letter and the journal entry about their private thoughts suggest a sympathetic reader. This may account, at least in part, for students' feeling comfortable with these two forms.

Questionnaire Section IV - Interest in Form: Extensive

A newspaper or magazine article, the least restrictive of the questionnaire offerings in this section, proved to be the preferred extensive form. Students responding to the questionnaire indicated a strong lack of interest in writing a research report. The interviewed students, too, indicated an interest in journalistic writing; however, they also showed a great deal of interest in writing either an essay or a research report. That show of interest can be accounted for by the fact that the small group of students had recently completed a slowly-paced research project that several had found quite fulfilling. Also, by being able to discuss their choices, the interviewed students perhaps weighed and considered their alternatives more fully than did the other group.

Questionnaire Section V - Preference for Concrete/Abstract Subjects

These twelfth grade students exhibited a preference for writing about concrete subjects rather than abstract ones. This result is compatible with their previous choices of writing about familiar, personal subjects. It is

notable that "writing about what a word means to me, for example, love, patriotism, or injustice" is the only questionnaire entry that stimulated a pattern of responses that failed to show a significant chi-square. The interviewed students' comments somewhat clarify the situation. Because that particular assignment could lend itself to tasks ranging from simple journal entries to highly structured library papers, individual experiences of the students responding to the questionnaire could have been quite diversified.

Questionnaire Section VI - Preference for Mode: Reflexive/Extensive

Consistently, students in both parts of the study indicated a preference for the reflexive mode. The interviewed students added the consideration of audience; most of them felt comfortable writing about their thoughts and feelings if a trusted teacher were going to share their writings. Many, however, were reluctant to share their personal ideas with their peers.

Questionnaire Section VII - Preference for Degree of Rhetorical Context

Respondents to the questionnaire and interviewees alike gave ambiguous answers in response to the extent to which they preferred rhetorical context. The comments written in on the questionnaire tended to be less informative than comments on previous sections had been. Even though students prefer to know more about a writing task than simply to be told to write about a certain topic, their interest in assignments situated someplace between being provided with a topic or form and being told to write and the other extreme of a writing task that becomes an instructional essay requiring indepth reading in order for the student to ascertain the many rhetorical constraints that have been implied by the assignment.

Discussion

In summary, there appears to be few discernible differences between writing interests of students in the two groups involved in this research

project. By and large, these twelfth grade students' differences are individualistic rather than categorical. In other words, teachers can assume a great many common interests among their twelfth grade students, such as a preference for writing from a personal viewpoint about subject matter which is familiar to them; however, individual differences will determine each student's approach to these general perspectives. Although students prefer writing in the reflexive mode, after they have been given opportunities to experience writing assignments that gradually become more demanding in their requirements, they apparently enjoy a variety of forms and of contextual patterns.

Of utmost importance is students' relationships with their teachers, past and present. Clearly, those students who receive positive feedback from their elementary school teachers develop positive attitudes toward writing, gain self-confidence, and approach writing as an enjoyable, though difficult, undertaking. Furthermore, as students move through the levels of formal education, both the emotional-personal relationship with the teacher and the teacher's educational expertise are significant factors. Although writing fluency reflects students' cognitive and developmental stages of growth, the interview transcriptions emphasize the interaction with the affective dimension. Effective writing instruction takes place when a teacher establishes classroom practices that capitalize on that interaction, encouraging the development of writing ability by engaging students' interest in all aspects of the writing process.

References

Baldwin, D. R. & Wolford, C. L. (1979). Some preliminary findings: Student preferences on essay examination topics. California English, September, 9-11.

Bell, J. B. (1971). A study of the written composition interests of senior high school students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon.

Berdie, D. R. & Anderson, J. F. (1974). Questionnaires: Design and use. Metchen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press, Inc.

Berthoff, A. E. (1978). Tolstoy, Vygotsky, and the making of meaning. College composition and communications, 29, 249-55.

Bloom, B. S. (1964). Taxonomy of educational objectives, handbook II, affective domain. New York: David McKay Company, Inc.

Bloom, L. Z. (1980). Teaching anxious writers: Implications and applications of research. Composition and teaching, 2, 47-55.

Braddock, R., Lloyd-Jones, o. & Schoer, L. (1963). Research in written composition. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teacher of English.

Britton, J., Burgess, T., Martin, N., McLeod, A. & Rosen, H. (1975). The development of writing abilities 11-18. London: Macmillan Education.

Buck, L. A. (1976). Psychological research and human values. North Quincy, MA: The Christopher Publishing House.

Coughlin, R. M. (1983, March). Issues in conducting qualitative research. Paper presented at the annual Conference on College Composition and Communication, Detroit.

Daly, J. A. & Miller, M. D. (1975). The empirical development of an instrument to measure writing apprehension. Research in the teaching of English, 9, 242-49.

Dewey, J. (1913). Interest and effort in education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Dewey, J. (1919). The sources of a science of education. New York: Liveright Publishing Corp.

Emig, J. (1971). The composing processes of twelfth graders. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Emig, J. (1977). Writing as a mode of learning. College composition and communication, 28, 122-28.

Fenstermacher, G. D. (1980). On learning to teach effectively from research on teacher effectiveness. In A. Lieberman & C. Denham (eds.) Time to learn. Sacramento: California Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing.

Flesh, R. (1955). Why Johnny can't read. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Gay, P. (1981). The de-composing process: How teachers interfere with students learning to write. Paper presented at the Virginia Association of English Meeting, Blacksburg, Virginia.

Hogan, T. D. (1980). Students' interest in writing activities. Research in the teaching of English, 14, 119-26.

Izard, C. E. (1977). Human emotions. New York: Plenum Press.

Lacampagne, R. J. (1968). A national study of selected attitudes and approaches to writing of twelfth grade students with superior writing performance versus those with average writing performance. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois.

Lemon, N. (1973). Attitudes and their measurement. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Myers, M. (1983). The relationship between the teacher and the researcher. In M. Myers & J. Gray (eds.) Theory and practice in the teaching of composition. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Perl, S. (1980). Understanding composing. College composition and communication, 31, 363-69.

Purves, A. C. & Beach, R. (1972). Literature and the reader. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Rose, M. (1980). Rigid rules, inflexible plans, and the stifling of language: A cognitivist analysis of writer's block. College composition and communication, 31, 389-401.

Steiner, I. D. & Fishbein, M. (1965). Current studies in social psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc.

Wilson, P. S. (1971). Interest and discipline in education. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

TABLE 1

COMPARISON OF BOY/GIRL PREFERENCES

Rank	1	2	3	4	5
I. (A)	-2.70*	0.04	0.38	0.32	2.65*
(B)	-0.87	-1.17	1.30	1.88	-1.34
(C)	-0.25	1.08	-0.30	0.21	-0.87
(D)	0.78	1.50	-1.07	-2.33*	1.53*
(E)	3.02*	-1.25	-0.37	0.22	-2.41*
II. (A)	3.30*	-0.41	-0.63	-1.30	-0.60
(B)	0.17	-1.04	-0.14	1.48	-0.52
(C)	-0.44	1.73	0.18	-1.48	0.66
(D)	0.44	-1.38	0.69	0.98	-0.52
(E)	-1.87	1.58	0.21	0.08	0.76
III. (A)	-0.40	0.01	0.29	-0.07	0.48
(B)	1.67	0.54	-1.05	-0.85	-0.26
(C)	-2.75*	-2.17*	1.25	1.45	-1.56
(D)	0.57	3.01*	-1.16	0.02	-1.80
(E)	0.97	-0.91	0.41	-0.31	-0.03
IV. (A)	1.09	1.74	0.76	-1.80	-1.25
(B)	1.45	0.00	-0.71	-1.06	-0.11
(C)	-2.23*	0.87	0.23	0.88	0.36
(D)	0.93	-1.54	0.78	-0.01	-0.07
(E)	-1.42	-0.67	-1.14	1.89	1.13
V. (A)	5.24*	1.13	-0.64	-4.94*	-0.49
(B)	-1.59	1.76	1.56	1.44	-2.62*
(C)	0.25	0.14	-0.80	1.72	-1.25
(D)	-1.81	-1.81	-0.10	0.44	3.48*
(E)	-1.93	-0.80	0.13	2.06*	2.14
VI. (A)	4.04*	1.87	-0.94	-1.41	0.25
(B)	1.54	1.52	3.64*	1.17	-5.34*
(C)	1.66	-0.91	-1.14	-0.20	1.23
(D)	-0.29	-1.97	-3.79*	2.02*	3.69*
(E)	-5.09*	0.22	2.83*	1.85	2.62*
VII. (A)	-4.56*	0.14	2.71	1.40	1.80
(B)	2.62*	1.42	-1.48	-0.80	-0.78
(C)	2.35*	0.66	-2.17*	-1.16	0.29
(D)	-0.38	-0.82	1.04	-0.10	0.29
(E)	1.74	-1.28	0.38	1.08	-1.56

Number of boys 319
Number of girls 252
Total subjects 571

*Notes a significant difference at the .05 level.

TABLE 2

COMPARISON OF FLUENT/NON-FLUENT PREFERENCES

Rank		1	2	3	4	5
I.	(A)	-1.75	0.31	0.11	2.83*	-0.97
	(B)	2.83*	-1.37	0.63	-2.14*	-0.15
	(C)	-1.33	0.32	0.64	0.68	-0.89
	(D)	-0.97	-0.12	-0.30	0.28	0.56
	(E)	0.49	0.97	-1.05	-2.38*	1.61
II.	(A)	2.33*	1.25	1.36	-0.61	-1.18
	(B)	0.95	1.44	0.40	-1.08	-1.24
	(C)	0.25	-2.44*	-1.30	1.81	0.85
	(D)	-0.32	-0.94	0.86	0.06	0.60
	(E)	-2.08*	0.20	1.71	-0.38	1.76
III.	(A)	-3.34*	0.88	1.38	2.06	0.39
	(B)	3.05*	-0.30	-1.74	-1.00	-0.17
	(C)	0.20	-2.45*	0.99	0.11	1.23
	(D)	-0.38	-0.86	-0.09	-1.53	2.66*
	(E)	1.35	2.79*	-1.00	1.09	-4.54*
IV.	(A)	0.51	-2.64*	0.51	2.84*	-1.00
	(B)	1.29	-0.34	-0.05	-1.21	-0.05
	(C)	-0.27	0.74	-0.94	-0.72	1.11
	(D)	-2.03*	0.03	0.16	1.31	0.36
	(E)	0.38	1.93	0.45	-2.13*	-0.47
V.	(A)	0.03	1.59	0.28	-0.73	-1.31
	(B)	2.55*	-0.06	-1.35	0.03	-0.48
	(C)	-1.55	-1.75	1.28	-0.14	1.93
	(D)	-1.87	-0.74	0.36	0.44	1.81
	(E)	0.95	0.91	-0.80	0.63	-2.81*
VI.	(A)	-1.42	0.52	0.84	-0.93	1.22
	(B)	0.79	2.95*	-1.31	-0.67	-8.37*
	(C)	-0.60	-1.48	1.68	1.41	-1.43
	(D)	-2.60*	-0.51	-0.60	-0.01	1.06
	(E)	1.20	-0.28	-1.38	0.51	-0.49
VII.	(A)	0.56	0.81	-2.57*	0.33	0.46
	(B)	-1.07	-1.77	1.85	1.01	-0.58
	(C)	1.34	-3.73*	0.11	-1.51	-1.07
	(D)	-0.92	0.97	0.31	-0.57	0.05
	(E)	-0.45	-1.04	-0.15	0.90	0.54

Number of fluent 341
Number of non-fluent 230
Total subjects 571

*Notes a significant difference at the .05 level.